31: Danielsson--90 (1946-48) 1949 Jivaro
116, 128, 571

"In Table II we find an index of interaction for all the three geographical groups taken separately. The following formula was used:

$$\frac{\text{total choices made} \times 100}{N^2 - N}$$

Table II
Interaction for Each Geographical Group

Geographical group	Possible choices	Made choices	Percentage
Patuca	462	348	75.32%
Yurupaza	380	312	79.61%
Yaupi	506	190	37.54%

The low figure for the Yaupi group is explained by the fact that it is broken up into two parts (see Charts VI and VII), each one with an interaction index over 75% (families I-III: 76.20% and families IV-VI: 78.33%). Compared with the Vermont study (5) interaction within each geographical group is very high. In the Vermont study interaction was never higher than 56%, and in the studies made in our civilized societies the figure is usually below 30%."

"5. Lundberg, George A.: 'Attraction Patterns in a Village', Sociometry, no. 3-4, 1938."

31: Danielsson--90-91 (1946-48) 1949 Jivaro
116, 128, 571

"The cohesion within each group is shown in Table III. It is strikingly high. In all the geographical groups some few individuals have a central position chosen by the majority. Few or no choices are made by individuals from outside their own geographical group and few choices go to outsiders. The centripetal tendency is pronounced. The cohesion is computed by the following formula:

$$\frac{\frac{Ca+Ci}{I}}{\frac{Co}{O}} + \frac{O(Ca+Ci)}{ICo} \qquad [91]$$

where the letters indicate:

I = Number of individuals in in-group
0 = Number of individuals in out-group who receive choices from the in-group
Ci = Number of choices coming in
Co = Number of choices going out
Ca = Number of choices among the members of the in-group"

" TABLE III

Cohesion Within Each Geographical Group

Group	Choices per capita per members of in-group
Patuca	21.00
Yurupaza	9.50
Yaupi	10.66

This centripetal tendency is graphically demonstrated in the Charts II, IV and VI. If we for instance take Chart VI, the I (the number of individuals in the in-group) is 3 (IIa, VI6D, and V123D), 0=16, * Ci=26, Co=16, and Ca=6. The result according to the formula:

$$\frac{16(6+26)}{3\times 16} = \frac{512}{48} = 10.67\text{"}$$

* Not indicated on the graph.

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

Jivaro Souls

MICHAEL J. HARNER
University of California, Berkeley

THE Jivaro proper (*auetuar tsaurat*) of eastern Ecuador have long been famous for their warlike practices,[1] but the assumptions about reality upon which they predicate such behavior have not been systematically studied and analyzed.[2] A very important series of these assumptions is to be found in the Jivaro ideas concerning souls. Among these concepts has recently been discovered a deep-seated belief that killing leads to the acquisition of souls which provide a supernatural power conferring immunity from death. The purpose of the present paper is to outline some of the basic elements of these beliefs, with the hope of providing a greater insight into Jivaro behavior.[3]

The emphasis here will be on previously new data collected in 1956-57,[4] but the concluding paragraphs of the paper embody a commentary on relevant statements in the major publications dealing with this subject. At the outset it should be mentioned that I took the two most useful works on the Jivaro (Karsten 1935; Stirling 1938) into the field and went over them in detail with native informants. Accordingly, points of difference between the following material and that given by Karsten and Stirling should definitely be taken by the reader to indicate modification or refutation of the previously published statements, at least in regard to the Jivaro proper.[5]

Field research providing the present data was conducted for ten and a half months in the following river valleys occupied by the Jivaro: the Rio Upano and its tributaries, the Rio Tutanangoza and the Rio Sapa; the Rio Chigoaza; the Rio Macuma; the Rio Cangaimi; the Rio Cusimi; the Rio Mangosiza, and in a refugee Jivaro settlement near Bucay on the western slope of the Andes. Informants who contributed particularly to the information embodied in the present paper were: *MukumpU*, *TsakimpU*, *Utitl Akaju*, *Kugutl*, and *Unta Akaju* of the Rio Tutanangoza; *Mata* of the upper Rio Macuma; and *Hintat* of the Rio Cangaimi. Chief interpreters were *HuwgA*, *Tupi*, and *Naita*, all from the Rio Tutanangoza region.

The best information on supernatural concepts was obtained in intensive eight or nine hour daily interviews with single informants over periods of a few days to several weeks. This was an exhausting procedure for all involved: interviewer, interpreter, and informant, but was conducive to the elicitation of truthful detail. Informants' accounts were continually cross-checked and contradictions called to their attention individually. An informant, when thus confronted with a contradiction, and with his reputation for knowledge and veracity at stake, generally provided elaborative supporting detail which he might not have otherwise volunteered.

[For explanation of footnotes, see category 116, pp 260-262 --Catalyst]

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

Reluctance of informants to talk about supernatural or personal matters was in part overcome by paying them well for the time they put in. Payment was commonly in the form of black gunpowder, percussion caps, lead shot, glass and metallic beads, and cloth. In localities of Ecuadorian and missionary settlements, money was used as well. In visiting strange households, I found that a gift of an ounce or two of gunpowder invariably resulted in a friendly stay, since almost all Jivaro men today possess firearms and continuously need replenishment of their supplies of ammunition. Leave-taking in the more isolated parts of the tribal territory typically involved assuring the host of my future return and "taking orders" for additional types of trade goods to be brought on the next visit. Thus, my host viewed my continued friendship to his advantage and an amiable departure always occurred, despite the fact that I was often leaving directly (with gunpowder and other goods) for a household or neighborhood with which he was feuding.

The following summary of soul beliefs is presented with two major reservations. First, as a summary, it omits consideration of the high degree of personal variability which is so characteristic of this population; what is presented here is a consensus of the views of men who were looked upon as experts in the field of religious beliefs and practices by the other members of the tribe. Second, I do not claim to have completely mastered the intricacies of Jivaro supernatural concepts; what is presented here should be viewed as a progress report on our knowledge of Jivaro soul beliefs. I fully expect additional field research to result in refinements of some of the statements presented here.

The 4,500 to 5,000 Jivaro proper live in a dense tropical rain forest environment amidst the hilly terrain at the foot of the eastern slope of the Ecuadorian Andes. The main source of food is shifting horticulture, with sweet manioc the chief crop. Hunting and fishing also have important roles in the economy. The basic economic and social unit is the nuclear family which most commonly occupies a house by itself. Such houses are scattered throughout the forest in very loose-knit neighborhood groupings, the Jivaro preferring not to live close together for explicitly-voiced anti-social reasons. Except in time of war, formal political organization is completely lacking at the neighborhood level and is never found at the tribal level. Suspicion and hostility are characteristic of the attitude toward fellow tribesmen, including many close relatives. Sorcery as well as murder by means of physical violence and poisoned food and drink are prevalent in the society.

Jivaro soul beliefs constitute one of the four major autonomous systems of verbalized thought so far noted in their culture. The other three are the systems of crop fairy (*nuya*) beliefs, of witchcraft beliefs, and the kinship system. On a conscious level, each of these systems derives from independent assumptions and can be described as a logical unit in itself, though these conceptual systems may be functionally interrelated as an expression of subconsciously existing needs. Since belief in one of these systems is not explicitly based upon belief in another, an adequate understanding of Jivaro soul beliefs

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

183 182 128 can be achieved without recourse to the beliefs regarding nunui, witchcraft, or kin-ship.

Three kinds of souls are recognized. The first type to be described is the 794 *arutam wakani*. This is an acquired soul and is believed by the Jivaroto be the most important kind. A man may possess up to two arutam souls at one time. The second type of soul is the *muisak*, or avenging soul. The third to be dealt with is the *nekas* wakani, the "true," "real," or "ordinary" soul.

THE ARUTAM SOUL[3]

Arutam wakani is perhaps best referred to as the "ancient specter" soul. [196] The term "arutam" alone refers to a particular kind of vision or apparition. "Wakani" alone simply means "soul" or "spirit." Thus, the arutam wakani [787] is the particular kind of soul which produces the arutam or vision. An arutam appears only occasionally and, when it does, is only an existence for less than a minute. The arutam *soul*, on the other hand, exists eternally once it has [154] been created. It is in the system of thought regarding the arutam soul that the Jivaro seek security from the ever-felt menace of death.

The Jivaro believe that the possessor of a single arutam soul cannot be [761] killed by any form of physical violence, poison, nor by sorcery, although he is [164] not immune to death from contagious diseases such as measles and smallpox.[4] [152] In other words, a person who has even only one arutam soul in his possession is relieved from daily anxiety about being murdered. A Jivaro who is for- [154] tunate enough to possess two arutam souls cannot die of *any* cause whatever, including contagious disease.

A person is not born with an arutam soul. Such a soul must be acquired, [761] and in certain traditional ways. The acquisition of this type of soul is considered to be so important to an adult male's survival that a boy's parents do [562] not expect him to live past puberty without one. Women sometimes obtain [628] arutam souls, but it is not considered so essential for them. One reason is that intra-tribal killing, the most common source of violent death, is primarily directed at adult males rather than at women and children.

A boy begins seeking an arutam soul at about the age of six years. Ac- [852] companied most commonly by his father, he makes a pilgrimage to the sacred [788] waterfall of his neighborhood. This is always the highest waterfall within a [718] few days travel. It is believed to be the rendezvous of these souls which wander [785] about as breezes, scattering the spray of the long cascade. By night the pil- [876] grims sleep near the falls in a simple lean-to. Here they fast, drink tobacco water,[5] and await the appearance of an arutam to the vision-seeker. They may keep up this fasting for as long as five days. If unsuccessful, they return home to make an attempt again at a later date.

794 787 If the arutam seeker is fortunate, however, he will awaken at about mid-night to find the stars gone from the sky, the earth trembling, and a great wind toiling the trees of the forest amid thunder and lightning. To keep from being blown down, he grasps a tree trunk and awaits the arutam. Shortly the arutam appears from the depths of the forest, often in the form of a pair of

32 Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

The arutam soul belief system contains a number of significant supernatural traits organized together into one internally logical complex. In this system the central idea of immunity from death is combined with such anthropologically well-known concepts as: a vision quest; a guardian spirit; eternal and multiple souls; a variety of generalized ancestor worship; reincarnation; soul-loss; soul-capture; nonshamanistic spirit possession; and a concept of personally-acquired impersonal power, kakarma, which resembles, but is not precisely identical to, the Oceanian mana.

The concept of the muisak furnishes the rationale for head-taking and shrinking, as well as explaining as supernatural murders those deaths which in many other cultures would be ascribed to accidental causes. In conclusion, one may observe that the Jívaro are so preoccupied with killing in real life that it seems only consistent that their two most emphasized types of souls, the muisak and the arutam soul, are supernatural devices, respectively, for murdering and avoiding being murdered. Beyond this, it is clear that these internally coherent and complex bodies of belief are an important part of the Jívaro view of reality and, as such, affect their overt behavior.

A COMMENTARY ON PREVIOUS REPORTS

A few brief comments seem to be due the reader to clarify the differences between the statements presented here and those of Karsten and Stirling, the chief contributors to the literature on the Jívaro proper. The souls will be considered here in the same order as in the preceding body of the paper, with the arutam soul first.

The "arutam" dealt with here is the "*arutama*" of Karsten (1935:448–51) and the "*tsarutama*" of Stirling (1938:115, 116). Karsten's term is a corruption of "arutam," found in a trade language used between the Jívaro and the Ecuadorian mestizos living in the village of Macas. As Karsten (1954:25) has already pointed out, Stirling's term does not exist in the Jívaro dialect.

Karsten (1954:25) has stated, "The word *arútla* or *arútam* in the Jíbaro language means 'old'; as a religious term *arutama* may be translated into 'The Old Ones.' . . ." Actually, however, while both words do have the same root, and *arutA* does indeed mean "old" or "used," the term "arutam" refers exclusively to the special vision which I have termed "ancient specter." My informants assured me that it does not mean "old ones." Also an arutam, however frightening it may appear, never kills anyone, despite a statement to the contrary by Karsten (1935:450). Although Karsten (1935:448–50) had some of the visions described to him, he was unaware of the souls responsible for them and the related system of belief.

While Stirling (1938:115) recognizes a similarity between his "*tsarutama*" (arutam) and concepts of the mana type in other cultures, he is misleading in stating that "tsarutama" is the force itself or that "it gives supernatural properties to certain classes of animals, plants or natural phenomena." When an arutam appears to a Jívaro, it is actually recognized to be a vision, distinct from natural forms of life or other natural phenomena.

32:Harner E-5 (1956-1957) 1962 SD9 Jivaro SD9

194

ŋ English *ng* in sing (followed by a hard *g* sound when not the terminal phoneme)
p Spanish *p* (voiced like English *b* when following a nasal consonant, labialized when preceding *e*; palatized when following *ẽ* or *i* plus a nasal consonant)
r Spanish *r*
s Spanish *s*
š English *sh*
ts English *ts* in cats
t Spanish *t* (voiced like Spanish *d* when following a nasal consonant; palatized when following *ẽ* or *i* plus a nasal consonant)
w English *w* (but voiced like English *v* when adjacent to *i*)
y Spanish *y*

Unvoiced vowels (restricted to ultimate syllables) are capitalized. Stress is on the penultimate syllable unless otherwise noted. A tilde indicates nasalization.

121

[2] A more detailed presentation is intended for inclusion in a future monograph.

128 ●

[3] The fieldwork was sponsored primarily by the Henry L. and Grace Doherty Foundation, with supplementary grants provided by the Department of Anthropology and the Museum of Anthropology of the University of California, Berkeley; by the American Museum of Natural History; and by the American Anthropological Association (SKF contract grant). John H. Rowe of the University of California contributed greatly to the undertaking of the fieldwork through his encouragement and advice. [122]

127

[4] I wish to acknowledge my debt to these two previous fieldworkers. Their material provided innumerable leads for investigation and made my own research much more productive than it otherwise would have been.

[5] Arutam may also be pronounced *aruma*, since the final vowel and consonant are interchangeable, as is the case with many Jivaro words. See Turner (1958) for a discussion of this and some other linguistic aspects of Jivaro. [194]

[6] Jivaro faith in the existence of arutam souls is so strong that all persons interviewed on the subject, even adolescents raised in mission boarding schools in the Río Upano valley, expressed a complete conviction in their reality. [183] [184]

[7] One of the members of the party may drink an infusion of *maikua* (*Datura* sp.) instead of tobacco water. Usually this is a person who has never seen arutam and therefore takes the drug to increase his chances of success. The other members of the group abstain from maikua in order to be able to restrain and protect the delirious person under its influence. [176]

[8] One exception is the fireball arutam which only vanishes silently when touched. [180]

[9] Persons who have seen arutam can be surprisingly well singled out by this trait alone. [178]

[10] There is also a rare super arutam, *amasag*, whose soul is not so easily satisfied and does not leave the body of its possessor when such declarations are made. [126]

[11] The arutam soul resident in the body of a person is *not* his *own* soul in any permanent sense, but only the soul of some ancestral Jivaro dwelling there temporarily. [126]

[12] Visitors to the Jivaro are usually impressed by the near shouting which typifies conversations between Jivaro of different households and neighborhoods. The functional basis for this custom can be seen in the desire of the individual to advertise his arutam power by being forceful in speech and gestures. [191] [181]

[13] Muisak may be alternatively pronounced *muisha*. 174

[14] When a man does not cut off the head of a person he has murdered (i.e., when the victim belongs to his own tribe), he turns the corpse face down on the ground so that the victim's muisak is delayed in emerging through the mouth. Thus the murderer hopes to reach home before the avenging soul can catch him. [195]

[15] A rather astonishing amount of misinformation has been published regarding the tsentsak surrounding the tsantsa. I wish to re-emphasize that any contradictions between the information presented here and previous accounts indicates rejection of that material. 174 175 174

[16] The Jivaro practice shifting cultivation and move their house sites along with their gardens. 175 [241]

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

114 sisting that they had never heard of such a thing. Incidentally, I
121 never learned with which group he worked—a fact which he appeared to keep secret. I assumed that either the Indians with whom he worked had different concepts, or that he possibly supplied interpretations of his own.

It does not seem probable to me that basic changes in fundamental beliefs could take place in 30 years, so I am inclined to agree with you that the errors in my account were the result of wrong interpretation.

121 Since the purpose of the present book is to provide a broad
• 128 introduction to Jívaro culture rather than a detailed comparison with earlier publications, the reader will not find specific criticisms of Karsten's and Stirling's data in the following pages. These will be gradually provided in more specialized publications, which will also have the function of focusing on particular aspects of Jívaro life in greater detail. To the specialist who reads this work, however, I wish to say that statements that he finds here implicitly contradicting those of the two other authors may be taken, in fact, as explicit corrections of their accounts. A contradictory account here does not imply ignorance of their material.

Beyond this, of course, is the question of cultural change.
[115] First of all, I wish to note that several of my most important elderly informants were already raising families prior to Karsten's initial Jívaro fieldwork in 1916–18 and did not come into substantial first-hand contact with whites until fifteen to
[114] twenty years later. The fieldwork by Stirling occurred later, in 1930–31, but as Stirling himself noted above, the basic source of difference with my own material was probably his interpreter. In addition, I made a special effort to secure field data that would reveal those aspects of Jívaro culture that had changed or remained stable during this century, and the final chapter of the book is devoted to that subject.

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

174 residing in the Jívaro region were to some degree in contact with the peoples of the Andean highlands.

619 Today five Jivaroan tribes or dialect groups are known to inhabit the tropical forest of the Ecuadorian and Peruvian Amazon: the Jívaro[6]; the Achuara (Atchuara, Achual); the Huambisa; the Aguaruna; and the "Mayna"[7] (see Map 1). Of these, the Jívaro, or *untsuri šuarä*, is the best known. This is the tribe which is usually referred to in the literature and locally simple as the "Jívaro," "Jíbaro," "Shuar" or "Shuara," while the other three Jivaroan tribes are usually locally called by their special names.

101 The term "shuara" (*šuarä*) does not simply mean "Jívaro," as has sometimes been said, but means "man," "men" or "people" and is used by all Jivaroans except the Aguaruna to refer to any Indian or group of Indians (as opposed to whites, who are called *apačī*), without regard to cultural or linguistic affiliation. *Untsuri šuarä*, meaning "numerous Indians," is a more accurate native designation for the Jívaro proper, which is applied to them by the Achuara (*ačuarä šuarä*) to the east. An alternative term, *muraiya šuarä* ("hill Indians") is also applied to the Jívaro proper by the Achuara. The Huambisa (*tsumu šuarä*) refer to the Jívaro proper as "*makas šuarä*" or "*yukina šuarä*,"[8] while the Aguaruna call
• 128 them the "*patuka širaŋ*."[9] Since the native designations vary, and are not in common usage in the literature, the practice in the present study will be simply to use the term "Jívaro" when referring to this tribe. Other tribes, when mentioned, will be given their specific names, e.g., Achuara.

131 The Jívaro population, numbering an estimated 7,830
133 persons in 1956–57,[10] dwells chiefly between the Río Pastaza
161 in the north, and the upper Río Zamora in the south; and from about 1,200 meters altitude above sea level on the eastern slope of the Andes in the west to the Río Pangui

/text continues on p. 16/

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

but was still largely isolated from colonists' incursions by the swift, bridgeless Río Upano and its often deep canyon (see Plate 1), which acted as an obstacle throughout its length to eastward migration by the horse-dependent settlers. These localities (excluding missions and their environs) had, together with other areas of minimal white penetration, an estimated total population of approximately 2,205 persons. Beginning with Chapter II, the present tense will be used to describe interior Jívaro culture as it existed at the time of the original fieldwork. In other words, the "ethnographic present" is 1956–57.

Whether this population in the northern and eastern portion of the tribe was larger or smaller than in previous decades is difficult to determine in the absence of written records. It does appear, however, that three of the localities involved, the Río Chiguasa region, the middle Río Macuma area, and the Río Yaupi Valley, were not occupied by the Jívaro until around the turn of the century. These occupations were the consequence of head-taking raids by the Jívaro which forced the Achuara (*ačuarä šuarä*) to retreat northeastward from the Chiguasa and middle Macuma areas and the Huambisa (*tsunnu šuarä*) to withdraw southward from the Yaupi region. This territorial expansion by the Jívaro was a by-product, rather than a conscious purpose, of their *tsantsa* raids against these adjacent tribes.[38]

Once vacated, such formerly enemy-held regions attracted Jívaro from the Río Upano Valley, elderly *untsuri šuarä* informants explained, because the hunting and fishing were better than in the Upano area. The superior hunting and fishing were also given as the reason that families had, for decades at least, moved eastward across the Cordillera de Cutucú to join their tribesmen already settled there. Later, when white colonists entered the Upano Valley in large numbers from the

34:Harner E-4, 5 (1956-1969)1973 SD9 Jivaro SD9

28. Vacas Galindo, 1895, pp. 49–50; Anonymous, 1952, p. 38. 000
29. Karsten, 1935, p. 8.
30. Anonymous, 1952, pp. 32–33; 38.
31. Platt, 1932, pp. 93–94.
32. Most of the following historical information is derived from oral accounts of older Ecuadorian colonists and Jívaro. [173]
33. See Stirling, 1938, Plates 11–17.
34. Dirección General de Estadística y Censos, 1954, pp. 138; 141. These figures include the population of Macas. The Summer Institute of Linguistics aerial survey counted 256 Jívaro houses in the same region in 1956.
35. Drown, 1961, pp. 22, 31, 58–9, 140–44.
36. Macabeo and Jívaro oral histories. [173]

CHAPTER II

1. Although rainfall is fairly heavy, it is well distributed throughout the year, and the distinct seasonal differences found in much of tropical forest South America are not as evident here. Short term records are available for rainfall and temperature at the Ecuadorian settlements of Macas, Méndez, and Gualaquiza, all in the higher western portion of the region. These reports of annual rainfall range from 1,992 mm. at Gualaquiza to 2,599 mm. at Méndez, with the minimum for a single month at any station being 95 mm. Recorded average temperatures from these same stations range from 21.4 to 25.2 degrees Centigrade (Ferdon, 1950, pp. 73–74). 24 132
2. Cf. Steere, 1950, p. 85. 000
3. In an earlier paper (Harner, 1962, p. 269) I questioned whether the Jívaro had any gods or goddesses, but additional field study and analysis have led me to be less certain of the classificatory status of Nunuí and, in fact, of the definition of "gods" and "goddesses" in general. [128] •
4. Demons lack blood. [176]

CHAPTER III

1. Based upon a Summer Institute of Linguistics aerial survey in 1956–57 (Glen Turner, personal communication). The Jívaro population near the Macuma and Yaupi missions, comprising some eighty houses, is specifically excluded in the total here. 361 161 114

   The Summer Institute of Linguistics personnel were employing an intentionally conservative estimate of five persons per dwelling, which was used for earlier population estimates by the author (Harner, 1962, p. 259; 1963, p. 9; 1968b, p. 363). Additional research has led the author to revise the estimate of average household population upward to nine, and this is the figure employed in the present study. It seems impossible, however, to reconcile my results with those